



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,217	10/13/2000	Yoshiaki Tomotake	2000-1428A	3623

7590 03/18/2004

Wenderoth Lind & Ponack  
Suite 800  
2033 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER
----------

FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/673,217	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TOMOTAKE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lawrence D Ferguson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1774	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Response to Amendment**

1. This action is in response to the amendment mailed November 13, 2003.

Claims 9-12 are pending.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)**

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiya et al. (U.S. 4,758,461) in view of Suenaga et al. (U.S. 6,133,170).

4. ~~Akiya discloses an ink jet recording paper having excellent ink absorptivity (column 1, lines 6-10) and enhanced coloring density (column 6, lines 21-22).~~ *you wrote 2X*

Akiya discloses an ink jet recording paper having excellent ink absorptivity (column 1, lines 6-10) and enhanced coloring density (column 6, lines 21-22). Akiya discloses the recording paper comprises pulp such as LBKP and NBKP (column 3, lines 58-61) which are hardwood bleached kraft pulp and softwood bleached draft pulp, respectively. The reference discloses the paper is coated (column 31-40 and column 4, lines 33-38) which is not applied for improving ink absorption. Akiya does not disclose the liquid transfer

Art Unit: 1774

length in the Bristow method as being 100 mm or less. The determination of the liquid transfer length by Bristow's method is according to J. Tappi No. 51-87 is a product by process limitation. "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966.

Akiya does not show that the ink jet recording paper <sup>has mercerized pulp</sup> ~~has a~~ weight percent of the mercerized pulp as in instant claim 9. However, such weight percentage is a property which can be easily determined by one of ordinary skill in the art. With regard to the limitation of the weight percent, absent a showing of unexpected results, it is obvious to modify the conditions of a composition because they are merely the result of routine experimentation. The experimental modification of prior art in order to optimize operation conditions (e.g. weight percentage) fails to render claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results. The aforementioned limitation is optimizable as it directly affects the integrity and resiliency of the recording paper. As such, they are optimizable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the recording paper with the limitations of the weight percentage since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). ~~Akiya does not explicitly disclose mercerized pulp.~~ Suenaga teaches a recording paper (column 9, lines 17-26)

Art Unit: 1774

comprising bleached mercerized pulps (column 7, lines 1-6). Akiya and Suenaga are analogous art because they are both from the same field of recording papers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to mercerize the pulp of Akiya because Suenaga teaches mercerizing the pulp material reduces the density of the recording paper (column 7, lines 6-8).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Arguments to rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiya et al. (U.S. 4,758,461) are moot based on grounds of new rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Ferguson whose telephone number is 571-272-1522. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly, can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 1774

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'LDF', is positioned above the printed name of Lawrence D. Ferguson.

Lawrence D. Ferguson  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1774